

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 remain in the present application. Claim 20 is cancelled. Claims 1, 7, and 17 have been amended. Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the arguments set forth below.

35 U.S.C. Section 103 rejections

Paragraph 2-4 of the above referenced Office Action states that independent Claims 1, 7, and 17 are rejected as being unpatentable over Gupta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,389,532) in view of Boyle et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,212,636) and in view of Gibbs et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,085,321). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Independent Claims 1, 7, and 17 have been amended to more clearly point out aspects of the present invention. Independent Claims 1, 7, and 17 each recite blocking transmission of a content file when the data comprising the content file is a restricted data format. The independent claims recite examining the content file to determine whether the content file includes the digital signature, transmitting the content file when the content file includes the digital signature, blocking transmission of the content file when the digital signature is not included, and blocking transmission when the data comprising the content file is a restricted data format. Thus, in addition to checking for the presence of a valid digital signature, the actual data comprising the content file is examined to determine whether it is a restricted data format. If so, transmission is blocked.

Paragraph 4 of the above referenced Office Action relies on Boyle to show blocking transmission of the content file when the content file comprises a restricted data format, as in the claimed invention.

Applicants traverse by pointing out that the “separation of data types” described in the cited section of Boyle (e.g., Boyle column 1 lines 35-40) is different from the “restricted data format” of the claimed invention. The claimed invention blocks transmission of the content file based on the format of the file, e.g., whether the file is an MP3 file, or the like. Boyle controls access to a file based on the type of data in the file. The access control recited in Boyle appears directed towards allowing trusted users to obtain needed files to process data while denying such access to non-trusted users. For example, Boyle specifically refers to denying access if the user is not identified as an authorized participant on a particular project (e.g., Boyle column 1, lines 45-48). Applicants respectfully assert that controlling access to data based upon trusted or non-trusted status is completely different from denying transmission of data based on the format of the data actually comprising a content file, irrespective of any user status. Each of the independent claims of the present application have been amended to explicitly recite this limitation.

Accordingly, Applicant asserts that the Gupta and Boyle combination does not show or suggest the claimed invention as recited in independent Claims 1, 7, and 17. Thus, the claimed invention as recited in Claims 1-19 is not rendered unpatentable by the cited combination within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. Section 103.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully asserts that all claims (Claims 1-19) are now in condition for allowance and Applicant earnestly solicits such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: 4/11, 2005



Glenn Barnes
Registration No. 42,293

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060